IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P (C) No. 3161 of 2026

Rakesh Kumar Singh, son of Late Birendra Kumar Singh, Resident of –Niwaranpur, near Adim Jati Seva Mandal, Holding No. 589, Ward No. 13, P.O.-Doranda, P.S.-Chutia, District-Ranchi.

… Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. Ranchi Municipal Corporation through its Chief Executive Officer, Ranchi, At- Kachahari Road, P.O.-G.P.O., P.S.-Kotwali, District-Ranchi.
2. Sub-Divisional Officer-cum-Rent Controller (under provisions of Jharkhand Building (Lease, Rent & Eviction) Control Act, 2000), Ranchi, At-Ranchi Collectorate, P.O.-G.P.O., P.S.-Kotwali, District-Ranchi.
3. Gurnam Singh son of Late Raghubir Singh, Resident of –Anantapur 3rd Street, P.O.-Doranda, P.S.-Chutia, District-Ranchi.
4. The State of Jharkhand through The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, At-Collectorate, Ranchi, P.O. –G.P.O., P.S.-Kotwali, Ranchi, District-Ranchi. … **Respondent(s).**

CORAM :SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. R.P. Singh, Sr. Advocate
: Ms. Bandana Singh, Advocate
: Ms. Ragini Kumari, Advocate
For the respondent(s) : Ms. Neha Pandey, Advocate.

……..

02/04.05.2026:

1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner in this writ petition has prayed for the following reliefs:-

a. **“** *To restore the "STATUS QUO ANTE" of the residential premises of the petitioner, within time fixed by this Hon'ble Court, i.e., status of the premises existing prior to 20-02-2026 and found in inquiry on 17-11-2021 (Annexure-3), i.e., status of the premises in habitable condition, to enable the petitioner to continue compliance of the order dated 22-10-2018 passed by this Hon'ble Court in L.P.A. No. 68 of 2017 (Annexure 1) and till such restoration of premises in habitable condition, the petitioner be exempted from depositing monthly rent of the premises as ordered by above;*

b. From making any further demolition of the premises without specific permission from this Hon'ble Court;

c. Ranchi Municipal Corporation to produce all records / documents. / Proceeding files before this Hon'ble Court on the basis of which it

has passed the Map for construction to be made by the Respondent No. -3 in the premises, even by encroaching over Harmu Rivers AND on such production, be pleased to pass an appropriate order in accordance with law;

d. The Respondent - Dy. Commissioner to take immediate enquiry and suitable action in the matter of illegally passing of map of the Respondent No. -3, illegally demolition of the residential premises of the petitioner and further taking appropriate step for making "STATUS QUO ANTE" so far, the premises of the petitioner".

3. It is the case of the petitioner that petitioner is tenant over the property in question, but now that property has been demolished. It is the claim of the petitioner that since the property has been demolished, the order of status-quo ante needs to be passed by this Court.

4. The learned Senior Counsel admits that eviction suit is pending before the appropriate Civil Court where the petitioner is a defendant.

5. From the arguments of the petitioner and also from the petition itself, it is clear that the Title Eviction Suit No. 8 of 2007 is pending before the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Ranchi. During pendency of the same suit, it is also admitted that the structure where the petitioner was residing as a tenant has been demolished on 28th February, 2026. It is also admitted that the petitioner did not move any application under Order XXXIX of the C.P.C, before the Civil Judge, Junior Division where the Title Eviction Suit No. 8 of 2007 is pending.

6. Once admittedly the entire building has been demolished, this Court cannot pass any order of the status quo ante. Since the Eviction Suit is still pending, it is expected that the Civil Judge, Junior Division will dispose of the Eviction Suit as early as possible and this demolition of the building will not by any means make the suit infructuous.

7. The issues framed by the Court including the issue of tenancy, relationship of landlord and tenant, and the issue of the effect on the tenancy after the demolition of the building, and the status of the petitioner, will also be decided in the same suit. It will be open to the petitioner to seek any interim relief before the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Ranchi, where the suit is pending.

8. In view of the subsequent development, i.e. the demolition of the building, the petitioner is not the occupant of the same building now, the question of payment of rent and its payability can also be raised by the petitioner before the Court where the suit is pending.

9. This application is thus **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

04.05.2026
Rashmi/-
Uploaded on:- 12.05.2026